DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 407 365 SP 037 276

AUTHOR Jensen, Rita A.; Shepston, Therese J. Kiley
TITLE Creating Collaborative Learning Environments for Preservice and Inservice Teachers.
PUB DATE Mar 97
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Environment; Early Childhood Education; Education Majors; Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; Faculty Development; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Methods Courses; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Reflective Teaching; Special Education; *Teacher Collaboration
IDENTIFIERS *Preservice Teachers

ABSTRACT

This paper describes an intervention which was designed to: (1) provide opportunities for preservice teachers to collaborate with and network with inservice teachers; (2) create an environment which facilitated collaboration and interaction among early childhood, elementary, and special education majors; and (3) model collaborative teaching and professional development for preservice teachers. Students (N=37) enrolled in two courses--"Primary Methods" and "Effective Teaching Strategies"--were participants in the study. The course instructors collaborated in teaching the two courses, and they created opportunities for the students to discuss their course readings with practicing teachers. Results indicate that most of the participants in this collaborative venture--both preservice and inservice teachers--found the experience to be beneficial. Many preservice teachers found examples of best practice in the "real world," and those who did not find examples of best practice were able to distinguish between examples and non-examples. Students identified positive aspects of the collaborative manner in which the courses were structured. Study results also clearly indicated those instances where preservice teachers invested minimal effort and, consequently, reaped minimal benefits. (Contains 15 references.) (Author/ND)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Running head: COLLABORATIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

ED 407 365

Creating Collaborative Learning Environments for Preservice and Inservice Teachers

Rita A. Jensen & Therese J. Kiley Shepston

Bradley University

Peoria, Illinois 61625

Prepared for:

Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association

March 24-28, 1997

Chicago, Illinois

SP037276

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. A. Jensen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This paper describes an intervention which was designed to:

1. Provide opportunities for preservice teachers to collaborate with and network with inservice teachers.
2. Create an environment which facilitated collaboration and interaction among early childhood, elementary, and special education majors.
3. Model collaborative teaching and professional development for preservice teachers.

Results indicate that most of the participants in this collaborative venture--both preservice teachers and inservice teachers--found the experience to be beneficial. Many preservice teachers found examples of best practice in the "real world," and those who did not find examples of best practice were able to distinguish between examples and non-examples. Study results also clearly indicated those instances where preservice teachers invested minimal effort and, consequently, reaped minimal benefits.

Purpose

The challenge of creating collaborative learning environments for preservice teachers has provided the impetus and direction for this paper. Many collaborative ventures focus on inservice teachers and/or teacher educators (Burnaford & Hobson, 1995; Button, Ponticell, & Johnson, 1996; Zemelman & Hyde, 1993), but the literature on the development of such opportunities for preservice teachers is much less pervasive.

As the authors of this paper have attempted to apply best practice principles in their undergraduate teacher preparation courses, they have been powerfully influenced by the positive ramifications and relationships that have continued to emerge. Since the collaborative element seemed to have such a significant impact, the researchers decided to investigate further the topic of creating collaborative learning environments. Their investigation focused on the following three objectives.

1. Provide opportunities for preservice teachers to collaborate with and network with inservice teachers.
2. Create an environment which facilitated collaboration and interaction among early childhood, elementary, and special education majors.
3. Model collaborative teaching for preservice teachers.

This triangulated collaboration provided the foundation for infusing a number of best practice principles (Zemelman, Daniels, & Hyde, 1993) into the early childhood, special education, and elementary programs. Preservice teachers were involved in experiential, constructivist, developmental, authentic, democratic, and collaborative learning experiences. These principles were constructed individually and collaboratively as preservice and inservice teachers scaffolded both theory and practice. Constructivism was essential to these processes. Consequently, a review of literature related to constructivisim begins the theoretical section of this paper. That review is then followed by overviews of the literature relating to collaboration and reflection within the context of teacher preparation and professional development.

Theoretical Framework

Beginning with a Constructivist Paradigm

Both preservice and inservice teacher education must promote teaching practices that mediate student construction of their own understanding. Therefore, teacher education programs must themselves be contructivist-based (Brooks, 1984; Brooks & Brooks, 1987; Loucks-Horsley, et al, 1990). Teachers more readily understand and apply constructivist methodologies when they are exposed to specific programs and approaches and have support systems based in real classrooms. Unless teachers are given ample opportunties to learn in constuctivist settings, to critically reflect on educational practice, and to construct their own visions, the instruction preservice teachers receive will be trivialized to a "cookbook" approach (Brooks & Brooks, 1993). Noddings (1990) challenges educators to invite students to search for understanding, appreciate uncertainty, and inquire responsibly. Noddings writes:

> Having accepted the basic constructivist premise, there is no point in looking for foundations or using the language of absolute truth. The constructivist position is really post-epistemological, and that is why it can be so powerful in inducing new methods of research and teaching. It recognizes the power of the environment to press for adaptation, the temporality of knowledge, and the existence of multiple selves behaving in consonance with the rules of various subcultures. (p. 12)

How do novice teachers learn to be reflective about their professional and personal decisions and actions? According to Eby and Kujawn (1994), the process must begin in courses which prepare students to teach. And in order to provide a construct for mediation, teacher educators must design collaborative opportunities for preservice teachers.

A Continuum of Collaborative Approaches

Preservice and inservice teachers can collaborate with one another in a variety of ways. Henderson (1996) suggests an overlapping continuum of collaborative approaches that are organized to enhance levels of commitment, career influence, and intimacy. The first approach,

collaborative exchanging, focuses on sharing information. Collaborative exchanging can take many forms within and across the preservice/inservice continuum. Exchanging is based on mutuality, and all parties feel free to share information through this collaboration. In the second approach, **collaborative modeling**, one professional demonstrates a particular teaching practice to one or more colleagues at the preservice or inservice level. Ross, Johnson, and Smith (1992) report that "this type of modeling provides students with clear evidence that faculty not only urge them to be reflective but actually engage in the process" (p. 31). **Collaborative coaching**, the third approach, involves one professional, who is usually more experienced, providing constructive feedback to another.

The next approach suggested by Henderson (1996), **collaborative supervision,** takes collaborative coaching one step further. Collaborative supervision implies that a professional, again generally one who is more experienced, provides feedback, but in collaborative supervision the feedback is evaluative and related to teacher performance. Henderson goes on to say that: "This collaborative approach is quite new and is not therefore well documented in the educational literature" (p. 191). The paradigm that is most familiar to teacher educators is the university supervisor/cooperating teacher/student teacher triad. In collaborative supervision, however, extensive questioning and deeper levels of reflection are encouraged than in the typical supervisory model. Collaborative self-assessment is also infused.

Completing the continuum, the approach that involves the highest level of commitment and intimacy is **collaborative mentoring**. In this relationship, a more experienced professional provides counsel and guidance to one or more less experienced colleagues. Daloz (1986) captures the role of mentors in the following description.

> Mentors are guides. They lead us along the journey of our lives. We trust them because they have been there before. They embody our hopes, cast light on the way ahead, interpret arcane signs, warn us of lurking dangers, and point out unexpected delights along the way. (p. 17)

The study described in this paper began at the level of collaborative exchanging. The authors have observed through this intial collaboration of preservice and inservice teachers, however, the emergence of many additional collaborative relationships. These connections seem to mirror the collaborative approaches proposed by Henderson (1996). Preservice teachers, after talking with their collaborating teachers, often decide to visit their classrooms. Then, they become involved as observers or volunteers. And, many times, they request to be placed in these classrooms for their novice and student teaching experiences. Sometimes the collaborating teachers become mentors; other times the preservice teachers develop mentoring relationships with a child, another preservice teacher, or a parent.

In most cases, when the collaboration has spiralled across all the approaches discussed on the continuum, the preservice and inservice teachers have been willing to engage in critical reflection. It seems extremely important that teacher educators recognize the stimulus that reflection provides for preservice and inservice teachers. With that in mind, the focus shifts to reviewing some of the literature on reflective teaching.

Nurturing Reflective Teaching

While analyzing the work of John Dewey, Pollard and Tann (1987) identified four essential characteristics of systematic reflective teaching:

> 1. Reflective teaching implies an active concern with aims and consequences, as well as with means and technical efficiency.
> 2. Reflective teaching combines enquiry and implementation skills with attitudes of open-mindedness, responsibility, and wholeheartedness.
> 3. Reflective teaching is applied in a cyclical or spiraling process, in which teachers continually monitor, evaluate, and revise their own practice.
> 4. Reflective teaching is based on teacher judgment, informed partly by self-reflection and partly by insights from educational disciplines.
>
> (pp. 4-5)

This model of reflective teaching focuses on skills and attitudes that teachers must develop. Based on the four characteristics listed above, Pollard and Tann (1987) have identified six enquiry skills that teachers can learn and apply in most any classroom situation. These include: 1) **empirical skills** which are concerned with collecting data and with describing situations, processes, causes and effects with care and accuracy; 2) **analytical skills** which are needed to interpret descriptive data; 3) **evaluative skills** which are used to make judgements about the educational consequences of the results of practical enquiry; 4) **strategic skills** which are directly related to planning for action and anticipating the consequences of its implementation; 5) **practical skills** which are skills involved in the action itself; and, 6) **communication skills** which are necessary because critical reflective pracitioners are concerned about aims and consequences as well as means.

The collaborative discussions and reflection required as a part of the teacher preparation program for early childhood, elementary, and special education majors provided an authentic context for preservice teachers to actually develop the skills and attitudes which support reflective teaching. Developing the link between reflection and professional practice is a process in which, "the learners interrogate practice and, in doing so, clarify their thoughts about what they do and their feelings about their practice" (Ghaye, Cuthbert, Danai, & Dennis, 1996, p. 5). Furthermore, collaborative exchanging provides the catalyst for fostering relationships among preservice and inservice teachers. These relationships often develop into collaborative modeling, coaching, supervision, and, occasionally, collaborative mentoring.

Unfortunately, most teachers have not been prepared to engage in reflection, especially during their preservice teacher preparation programs. The collaborative paradigm which provides the foundation for mediating theory and practice develops reflectivity for both preservice and inservice teachers. The transaction of meaning that is created as these relationships evolve is a critical element of reflective teaching. Collaboration is the key to enhancing the reflective skills

and attitudes of preservice teachers. One is reminded of the complexities of transacting meaning through the insights of Bruner (1971).

> World making...starting as it does from a prior world that we take as given, is constrained by the nature of the world version with which we begin the remaking. It is not a relativistic picnic....In the end, it is the transaction of meaning by human beings, human beings armed with reason and buttressed by the faith that sense can be made and remade, that makes human culture and by culture, I do not mean surface consensus. (p. 159)

Commitment to constructivism, collaboration, and reflective teaching must lead preservice teacher preparation as it moves into the 21st century.

Methodology

Beginning the Process of Collaboration

Students enrolled in this particular teacher preparation program are required to participate in field experiences beginning in their freshman year and continuing throughout their undergraduate education. In the course of completing these field experiences, they work with a variety of practicing teachers in a variety of settings. However, the authors of this paper wanted to provide a structured opportunity for preservice teachers to discuss the concepts, teaching strategies, and theories which they were reading about and learning about in class with practicing teachers.

Consequently, a number of collaborative opportunities for preservice teachers have been developed for early childhood majors, special education majors, and elementary majors in the context of a 4-year, university-based, teacher preparation and certification program. Building on five years of working cooperatively on a number of joint ventures, including some team teaching, the authors of this paper upgraded their efforts in the area of collaborative teaching as they planned for the next semester. Because the "Primary Methods" and "Effective Teaching Strategies" courses they teach have a number of objectives in common, they targeted those courses for a collaborative venture. After scheduling the courses to meet on the same days and at the same time, they planned and prepared jointly for their classes.

Project Participants

The 37 preservice teachers who completed the two courses identified above included four males, 33 females, four minorities, and seven non-traditional students. Four were special education majors, 13 were early childhood majors, and 20 were elementary education majors.

Procedures

When appropriate in terms of objectives and content addressed, the two classes met together. These joint sessions were structured to provide several opportunities for students from the two classes (and three different majors) to interact in small group settings. Because the instructors designed the instruction to be collaborative, preservice teachers from the early childhood, special education, and elementary programs worked together as they experienced a variety of classroom structures including jigsawing, critical reflection, workshops, and learning centers. In the context of these classroom structures, the preservice teachers planned integrated units, designed learning environments, developed concept webs, completed process portfolios, wrote and shared lessons, and constructed assessment plans. Although reading assignments were somewhat different for the two classes, in terms of course assignments, the requirements were identical.

In past semesters, special education majors and elementary education majors enrolled in "Effective Teaching Strategies" were required to write summaries and reflections in response to the assigned reading they were doing. Likewise, in previous semesters, early childhood majors enrolled in "Primary Methods" were required to keep learning logs in which they chronicled their thoughts and questions regarding the assigned reading they were doing. While these requirements, for the most part, motivated students to complete their assigned reading in a timely fashion, sometimes they questioned if what they were reading had anything to do with the "real world" of teaching and learning. Consequently, the instructors of these two courses conspired to create an opportunity for students to discuss their course readings with practicing teachers. The result was what the authors termed "collaborative reflections."

In addition to opportunities provided both in and out of the classroom for preservice teachers to collaborate with one another, the students also collaborated with inservice teachers whom they identified. These 37 students were asked to "recruit" inservice teachers of their choice who were willing to devote some of their time and attention to discussing with them the concepts and topics which the students were exploring. Those preservice teachers who indicated they needed some assistance in connecting with practicing teachers were given the names and locations of likely prospects.

Students were given the latitude to choose the means in which they communicated with their collaborating teachers (e.g., phone, mail, e-mail, in person). Approximately once every ten days, the preservice teachers contacted their collaborating teachers to discuss their readings and course activities. In addition, students were invited to pose questions that were motivated by their interests. Following their disucssions with their self-selected inservice teachers, the students then wrote collaborative reflections which included the following three components: summaries of the assigned readings; synopses of their discussions with their collaborating teachers, and their own reflections regarding class readings, class activities, and their collaborations. The ten collaborative reflections which students wrote throughout the semester were read and assessed by their instructors.

The final collaborative reflection took the form of a survey which all students completed. This survey asked students to reflect on the quality and nature of their interactions with their collaborating teachers. In addition, it asked for their thoughts regarding the collaborative manner in which the two courses were structured.

A survey also was sent to those inservice teachers who served as collaborating teachers. This survey paralleled the one which students completed. That is, it asked collaborating teachers to reflect on the quality and nature of their interactions with the preservice teachers who requested their participation.

Results

Objective 1: Provide Opportunities for Preservice Teachers to Collaborate with and Network with Inservice Teachers

Of the 37 preservice teachers who participated in this intervention, 29 chose collaborating teachers whom they already knew (e.g., former teachers, teachers who had supervised them in a previous field experience, family friends or acquaintances). Many students found examples of best practice in the "real world," and those who did not find examples of best practice were able to distinguish between examples and non-examples. Study results indicate that most of the participants in this collaborative venture--both students and teachers--found the experience to be beneficial. Even those students who initially were skeptical of this requirement found it to be worth the time and effort they invested in the process. Comments made by preservice teachers often conveyed their amazement regarding the discovery that theory and practice do connect. The following excerpts are typical of such comments.

From an early childhood education major: "I am really enjoying my conversations with Monica (her collaborating teacher). They make the entire process seem like it is actually culminating in something attainable."

From an elementary education major: "I am starting to get a grasp for the responsibilities that I will have to my students and their parents, and I find that talking with Maureen (her collaborating teacher) is helpful. The things that she says are right out of my books--proof that this isn't just a bunch of baloney!"

From an early childhood education major: "When I read The Primary Program: Growing and Learning in the Heartland, I think everything sounds so wonderful, but can it really work? Then I go visit Jolyn's (her collaborating teacher) classroom and see her implementing everything the primary program advocates. I get excited because I see that it really can work!"

Although on-site visits were not a requirement of their collaborations, 22 of the 37 participating students made at least one visit to their collaborating teachers' classrooms sometime

during the course of the semester. Their involvement ranged from observing to conducting whole group activities. Some preservice teachers read books to the classes, while others helped individual students with their work. All but one of those students who visited their collaborating teachers' classrooms reported that their interactions with their collaborating teachers increased following their visits.

Survey results indicate that the benefits of participating in this intervention outweighed the frustrations. When asked to identify specific benefits which resulted from their collaborations with their self-selected teachers, ten of the 37 students' responses related to the personal relationships which their collaborating teachers and they developed. These ten students reported that their collaborating teachers became mentors, role models, friends, and/or professional contacts they intended to maintain. The following are representative of other benefits identified by participating preservice teachers.

From elementary education majors:

"I learned how to incorporate children's literature into subjects"

"The chance to discuss how certain teaching strategies work in a real classroom environment"

"Learning how a teacher actually uses integration of curriculum"

"Seeing or hearing application of what we have been learning"

"I realized that teachers really care about students' well-being--sometimes more than their education."

From special education majors:

"I learned a great deal about ways to structure a curriculum without use of a basal."

"She helped me understand the classroom environment of special education."

From early childhood education majors:

"I learned to feel comfortable and open with a teacher, as if we were colleagues."

"I have learned that I must be able to articulate my philosophy readily and recall theorists for support."

"I learned how to deal with conflicting ideas a little. Jen and I disagreed often. I now have an idea of what it might be like to have conflicting ideas in the school."

As the preceding excerpt suggests, some students experienced cognitive dissonance in the course of completing their collaborations with practicing teachers. When asked to identify challenges or frustrations which resulted from her collaborations with her self-selected teachers, one student stated: "Although I value his teaching style, we had a lot of disagreements." Another commented: "I was quite frustrated with her feelings about Ritalin." One particular student apparently experienced more frustrations than benefits. She concluded: "Even though my collaborating teacher is young, her ideas about education are quite old-fashioned....It seemed as if she just didn't care. Her classroom was out of control, she didn't have a good classroom management system, but she thought all of her problems were the kids."

Fortunately, the above challenges and frustrations are not representative of those most commonly cited by participants. Both preservice and inservice teachers indicated that scheduling times to meet or talk was the greatest challenge inherent to their collaborating with each other.

Survey results also clearly indicated those instances where students invested minimal effort and, consequently, reaped minimal benefits. When asked to characterize the nature of her communication with her collaborating teacher, one student honestly responded: "The communication was not very good. I didn't take the initiative to ask her questions regarding the class materials. I talked to her for a small amount of time each time I was there, but it wasn't about the reading."

Another student described the nature of her communication with her collaborating teacher as "very open" and indicated that she communicated with her in person every week. The collaborating teacher characterized the nature of her communication with this student as "casual conversation as she picked her daughter up from school." When asked to identify benefits which resulted from her collaboration with this student, she replied, "none" and added: "I'm sorry, but I

do not feel I was this student's collaborating teacher. We visited a few times, but my association with her was mainly because I was her daughter's teacher."

An important secondary result of this intervention involved the collaborating teachers. Through their interactions with preservice teachers, some of them became more familiar with best practice and updated their own knowledge bases. Others reported that the experience provided them with an opportunity to articulate the rationale and theory behind their practice. Many inservice teachers indicated that it had been some time since they last had reflected on their personal responses to the question: "Why am I doing what I'm doing?"

The following quotations are representative of specific responses to a prompt asking inservice teachers to identify the benefits of their collaborations with preservice teachers.

"It helped me touch base with what I was utilizing as a classroom management plan and also why I use it."

"New and interesting views were given on different issues helped to reinforce the need to look at the whole child."

"I appreciated Mike's (preservice teacher) feedback on my current teaching techniques."

"I like hearing what's being taught in college these days. The exchange of ideas benefitted me."

"I'm flattered that someone wants to hear what I do in my class."

Within the papers they wrote as a result of their collaborations, students also related ways in which inservice teachers reported benefitting from their collaborative experiences. One early childhood education major wrote: "Sheryl (her collaborating teacher) and I are really learning from each other. Today I brought in The Primary Program: Growing and Learning in the Heartland and showed her the sample lessons for agriculture. Sheryl is taking her class on a field trip to a farm and found those lessons extremely helpful." Another early childhood education major related: "My collaborating teacher is giving me great ideas and is open to learning from me as well." Speaking of her collaborating teacher, an elementary education major wrote: "She stated that she

enjoys this project (collaborating) because it gives her the chance to stop and remember the key essentials that are necessary for the teaching process."

Objective 2: Create an Environment Which Facilitated Collaboration and Interaction Among Early Childhood, Elementary, and Special Education Majors

As inservice teachers, graduates of teacher preparation programs, regardless of their majors, will need to work as members of committees and teams. Teamwork necessitates the ability to relate to a variety of personalities, as well as to different types of teachers. In terms of designing and clearly articulating developmentally appropriate instructional opportunities for P-12 students, it is imperative that teachers be prepared to work toward a common goal, given the expertise that each member of the team brings to the process. The integrated services approach, as well as the regular education initiative, requires teachers to work collaboratively in order to provide for the needs of children and their families.

Consequently, it is logical for preservice teachers' undergraduate preparation to include multiple opportunities for them to collaborate with education students of different majors. Team teaching "Primary Methods," which is designed for early childhood education majors, and "Effective Teaching Strategies," which is designed for elementary education majors, provided students with such an opportunity. Small group activities, as described previously, were designed to facilitate interactions between and among special education majors, early childhood education majors, and elementary education majors.

When asked to reflect on the collaborative manner in which the two courses were structured, students identified several positive aspects of the "between groups" collaboration they experienced. Variety of perspectives and opportunities to meet and interact with more people were the two main themes which emerged from students' comments regarding the benefits of collaborating with different education majors. Specific responses which serve as representative examples of the benefits students identified include the following.

"Learned about early childhood"

"Collaborated with special education and elementary teachers before leaving college"

"Worked with education students from different areas"

"Met more people"

"Shared our differences"

"Received more peer feedback"

"Received a variety of feedback"

"Had twice as many ideas to use in class"

"Had more collaborative groups"

"Heard different perspectives"

No students indicated a preference for not collaborating with students from different majors. However, when asked to identify negative features of the collaboration, some students reflected on environmental variables, such as room temperature and crowded conditions. One respondent stated that students did not receive as much individual attention when working as a combined class, and, in a similar vein, two students indicated that the group size was too big when the classes met together.

Other students expressed a desire for more joint meetings between the two classes. Two respondents expressed disappointment at not being able to see the presentations of students in the other class, and one student stated that the only negative aspect of the collaboration between the two classes was "only occasionally being with the other class."

Objective 3: Model Collaborative Teaching for Preservice Teachers

It also is logical for teacher educators to model the attitudes and behaviors which they wish their students to exhibit. Therefore, two teacher educators collaborated in planning and teaching two related courses. They met together regularly to: prepare for joint class sessions, design and refine course requirements, adjust class agendas in response to student needs, and engage in

formative assessment regarding outcomes and course direction. Occasionally, the instructors also collaboratively assessed student work.

During the first class meeting of the semester, which was a joint session of the two classes, the instructors explained that the students would be involved in several collaborative ventures throughout the semester. The instructors also explained "why they were doing what they were doing." That is, they shared with students the importance of: collaboration, blending theory with practice, and teachers of all types working together to address student needs. In addition, the instructors emphasized to students the need to model behaviors they expected from their students.

Throughout the semester, as they reflected on the collaborative process, its benefits and drawbacks, the instructors often commented on the importance of the pre-existing foundation of a shared philosophy upon which their collaborative efforts were built. As a result of an invitation which one colleague extended to a new colleague who at the last minute was assigned to facilitate a seminar she had not previously conducted, the two team taught their respective sections of a seminar eight years ago. Through that experience, they identified each others' strengths, interests, and experiential bases and discovered that they shared common philosophies of the teaching/learning process. With the initial risk-taking phase out of the way, these two colleagues began to learn to play to each others' strengths and to develop strategies which built on those strengths.

When asked to reflect on the collaborative manner in which the two courses were taught, some students noted those strategies, other students commented that the instructors seemed to enjoy working with one another, and others remarked that they appreciated the humor that the instructors implemented in their collaborative teaching. The following comments are representative of other benefits students identified.

"Liked collaborating with another teacher"

"Shared two different teaching styles"

"Complementary teaching styles"

"Enjoyed having two professors"

"Good example for me to collaborate with other teachers"

"Role models of collaboration"

"Teaching was very well planned--with collaboration it has to be that way."

Although asked to identify negative aspects of the collaborative teaching they experienced, students listed none on their surveys. This phenomenon might be somewhat attributable to students "telling their instructors what they wanted to hear," since surveys were not completed anonymously. However, as a whole, these students typically were not shy about providing feedback to their instructors and were accustomed to engaging in both formal and informal course and instructor evaluation.

In terms of the instructors' observations, some students seemed reticent to ask questions of the "other teacher." "Real answers" seemingly could emanate only from their "real teacher." Such student behaviors seemed to parallel behaviors which have been observed in students who are in inclusion settings. That is, sometimes "regular education" students prefer to interact only with the "regular education" teacher. At least a partial explanation for this demonstrated preference may lie in the fact that students tend to interact more with teachers with whom they are familiar.

With regard to outcomes related to their collaborative teaching, the instructors realized increased joint research ventures and found that the experience served as a professional development opportunity for them. The experience also reaffirmed to the instructors the benefits of collaboration and motivated them to increase their efforts to establish and strengthen collaborative ties with their college's professional development school and its staff.

Educational Significance of the Study

Certainly initial teacher preparation has a major role to play in "transforming the profession," and the teacher preparation project described in this paper incorporates several best practice principles. In addition to the collaborative elements which were built into the project, students were provided authentic opportunities to learn more about the "real world" of teaching.

They also were invited to construct their own sense of the teaching/learning processes and to do so in environments which capitalized on social, holistic, and democratic principles (Zemelman, Daniels, & Hyde, 1993).

Because of the positive effects this collaborative venture produced for inservice, as well as preservice, teachers, it definitely demonstrated the potential for stimulating change and renewal. If novice teachers can enter the teaching profession with a basic knowledge of best practice principles and how to apply them and can be met with receptive attitudes from experienced teachers, the probability of positive change occurring will increase.

References

Brooks, J.G., & Brooks, M. G. (1993). In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Brooks, M. (1984). A constructivist approach to staff development. Educational Leadership, 42(3), 23-27.

Brooks, M. G., & Brooks, J. G. (1987). Becoming a teacher for thinking: Constructivism, change, and consequence. The Journal of Staff Development, 8(3), 16-20.

Bruner, J. (1971). The relevance of education. New York: Norton.

Burnaford, G., & Hobson, D. (1995). Beginning with the group: Collaboration as the cornerstone of graduate teacher education. Action in Teacher Education, 17(3), 67-75.

Button, K., Ponticell, J., & Johnson, M. J. (1996). Enabling school-university collaborative research: Lessons learned in professional development schools. Journal of Teacher Education, 47(1), 16-20.

Daloz, L. A. (1986). Effective teaching and mentoring: Realizing the transformational power of adult learning experiences. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Eby, J. W., & Kujawa, E. (1994). Reflective planning, teaching, and evaluation: K-12. New York: Merrill.

Ghaye, T., Cuthbert, S., Danai, K., & Dennis, D. (1996). Learning through critical reflective practice: Self supported learning experiences for health care professionals. Newcastle upon Tyne: Pentaxion Ltd.

Henderson, J. G. (1996). Reflective teaching: The study of your constructivist practices (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill.

Loucks-Horsley, S., Brooks, J. G., Carlson, M. O., Kuerbis, P., Marsh, D., Padilla, M., Pratt, H., & Smith, K. (1990). Developing and supporting teachers for science education in the middle years. Andover, MA: The National Center for Improving Science Education.

Noddings, H. (1990). Constructivism in mathematics education. Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 4, 1-12.

Pollard, A., & Tann, S. (1987). Reflective teaching in the primary school. London: Cassell.

Ross, D. D., Johnson, M., & Smith, W. (1992). Developing a PROfessional TEACHer at the University of Florida. In L. Valli (Ed.), Reflective teacher educator: Cases and critiques (pp. 24-39). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Zemelman, S., Daniels, H., & Hyde, A. (1992). Best practice: New standards for teaching and learning in America's schools. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.